

# U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 Clearance and Technical Review Form

## Instructions:

- Authors must inform their supervisor about scientific and technical work products they create prior to work product distribution or dissemination. The supervisor decides whether technical review is warranted, which requires use of the Clearance and Technical Review Form.
  - The following are instances in which the Clearance and Technical Review Form **must** be used: journal articles (manuscripts), book chapters, and books.
  - The following are instances in which the Clearance and Technical Review Form **may** be used, depending on the supervisor's decision: abstracts, posters, and presentations.
    - If the Form is **not** used, the author should obtain an email approving clearance.
- If technical review is required, the Clearance and Technical Review Form is used and must be completed in its entirety.
- If technical review is not required, but the Clearance and Technical Review Form is used, complete through Section I: Administrative Review.
- Disposition: author retains copy; supervisor retains copy; copy sent to Science Liaison.

Scientific and Technical Work Product Details (to be completed by the author)		
Title:	Multiscale Modeling of Background Ozone: Research Needs to Inform and Improve Air Quality Management	
Author(s) Name and Title:	C. Hogrefe <sup>1</sup> , B. Henderson <sup>2</sup> , G. Tonnesen <sup>3</sup> , R. Mathur <sup>1</sup> , R. Matichuk <sup>3</sup>	
Project Office/Organization:	1Center for Environmental Measurement and Modeling, ORD;2OAQPS/OAR;3ARD/Region8	
Type of Publication:	journal manuscript	
Draft Date:	07/06/2020	
Administrative Reviewer(s):		
Technical Reviewer(s):		
I. Administrative Review (Clearance)		
<i>This section documents approval to externally release the work product.</i>		
Item	Select	
1. Does this product need internal peer-review?	Yes	
2. Does this product use the appropriate disclaimer(s)? If no, then please suggest an appropriate one.	Yes	
3. Does this product have a Scientific Data Management Plan that complies with EPA's Public Access Plan?	Yes	
4. Does this product contain human subjects research (HSR)? If yes, did the HSR receive approval by EPA's Human Subjects Research Review Official?	Yes	
5. Does this product contain potential Dual Research of Concern (DURC)? If yes, please see EPA's DURC Policy.	Yes	
6. Does this product raise legal concerns that need to be further addressed? If yes, please consult with the Office of General Counsel or the Office of Regional Counsel.	Yes	
7. Does this product require advance notice of [P/O/R] senior leadership or other EPA programs, offices, or regions? If yes, please ensure advance notice procedures are followed.	Yes	
8. Upon clearance, should this product be submitted to the Science Inventory?	Yes	
Administrative Review – Signature Section		
Review Status (mark one)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable no comments.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable with comments, resubmittal not requested.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable with major revisions, comments should be addressed, resubmittal requested to verify corrections.	
For Returned Reports Only (mark one):		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were fully addressed.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were not fully addressed (return to supervisor).	
Administrative Reviewer:		
	Signature	Date

II. Technical Review		
Item	Select	Comments
1. Content and scope	Satisfactory	
2. Text, Tables, Figures appear sufficient to represent the data and support the work product. Calculations, data reductions, spreadsheets, etc. were correct and sufficiently described to allow reproducibility by another qualified individual.	Satisfactory	
3. Organization and presentation.	Satisfactory	
4. Quality of data & validity of analytical techniques.	Satisfactory	
5. Soundness of conclusions.	Satisfactory	
6. Editorial quality	Satisfactory	
7. Additional comments:		

  

Technical Review – Signature Section		
<i>This section documents technical review.</i>		
<i>Multiple technical reviews can either be separately attached or cumulatively summarized here by the author.</i>		
<b>Review Status (mark one)</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable, no comments.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable with comments, resubmittal not requested.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable after major revisions, comments should be addressed, resubmittal requested to verify corrections.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not acceptable	
<b>For Returned Reports Only (mark one):</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were fully addressed.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were not fully addressed (return to supervisor).	
<b>Technical Reviewer:</b>		
	Signature	Date

  

III. Report Approval Authority – Signature Section		
<i>This section documents acknowledgement of the technical adequacy of the work product.</i>		
<b>Review Status (mark one)</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reviewed, no comments.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reviewed with comments, resubmittal not requested.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Returned, comments should be addressed, resubmittal requested to verify corrections.	
<b>For Returned Reports (mark one):</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were not fully addressed (return to supervisor).	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments were adequately addressed.	
<b>Report Approval Authority:</b>		
	Signature	Date

Reset Form